THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. XX JULY, 1945 NO. 3

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Shakspere In the USSR	*Eugene Blum*	99
Boris Pasternak's Translation of *Othello*	*Prof. M. M. Morozov*	103
Shakspere on the Stages of Erevan, Tbilisi, Baku	*Prof. M. M. Morozov*	105
Shakspere En France	*Maximilien Rudwin*	110
Why Not Fleance?	*John C. McCloskey*	118
The Authorship of the *Second Maiden's Tragedy* and *The Revenger's Tragedy* (Conclusion)	*Richard H. Barker*	121
A Prologue for *The Winter's Tale,* Acts IV and V	*Stanley P. Chase and George H. Quinby*	134
La Misa Del Gallo and Shakspere's "Bird of Dawning"	T. M. Pearce	140

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1943, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/shakespeare-association-bulletin_1945-07_20_3

SHAKSPERE IN THE USSR

By EUGENE BLUM

IN APRIL 1941, two months before Germany invaded Russia, Professor M. M. Morozov emphatically stated in his article "The Bard of Avon feels at Home in the USSR," commemorating the 325th anniversary of Shakspere's death: "Shakspere did not just visit the Soviet Union; he came to stay with us."

Prof. Morozov has no difficulty in proving his case. All he asks us to do is to examine the repertories of the Moscow theaters for the current season. This alone proves the popularity of Shakspere in Russia. We find *Othello* running to packed houses at the Maly Theater. The Theater of the Revolution is performing *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *Romeo and Juliet. Taming of the Shrew* is being billed by the Central Theater of the Red Army. The Bauman Theater and the Central Railway Men's Theater are drawing the public with *A Comedy of Errors. King Lear* at the State Jewish Theater is already playing for the sixth consecutive year, and *Much Ado About Nothing* at the Vakhtangov Theater has been running for several years. A comic operetta (music by Shenshin) based on *Twelfth Night* is being put on by the Operetta Theater.

Several Shakspere works, which had not been performed before, made their appearance. *The Winter's Tale,* for instance, had been added to the repertory in the city of Gorky. *Antony and Cleopatra* is being rehearsed in Leningrad at the theater directed by Radlov and the drama theater in Tomsk. The Theater of Leninist Komsomol in Moscow is also working on *The Winter's Tale.* A number of workers from the Aviakhim Plant recently presented a creditable performance of *Cymbeline.* Two professional theaters, one in Moscow and the other in the provinces have taken up *Cymbeline.*

The most important feature of the current Soviet theatrical season is, of course, the particular attention which is

being given to the production of *Hamlet.* The Moscow Art Theater, the greatest in the Soviet Union, is continuing its work on this play. *Hamlet* is a permanent part of its repertory since it was staged there by Gordon Craig. Other theaters featuring *Hamlet* are the local organizations in Kursk, Stalingrad, Tbilisi, Archangel, Novosibirsk, Tula and Voronezh.

Prof. Morozov thus describes his impressions of *Hamlet* in the city of Voronezh, where he saw the production in January, 1941:

". . . The hall is packed. The audience is in waiting anticipation. The curtain rises and reveals a cold, northern sky, sprinkled with stars, and the snow-touched battlements of a medieval castle. The sentinels appear on their rounds, and then, a moment later, the figure of the Ghost is seen against the starry sky.

"How well this role is understood! The audience is not treated to a supernatural specter achieved by cheap magic or a rotting corpse, horrifying in its very naturalism. No, it is a sorrowing father, boundlessly devoted to his son."

"The second scene opens with a banquet in the large hall of the castle. Standing on one side, with arms folded, is Hamlet. All attention is drawn to him. Actor Polyakov portrays a passionate, temperamental Hamlet. He gets the bitter irony across with success."

"The scenes between Hamlet and Polonius are excellent. Warm laughter among the audience greets the old man's utterances. It is with great élan that Polyakov plays the scene in the queen's apartment—here is a very interesting scenic moment: Hamlet gazes fixedly at the portrait of his father and the portrait slowly comes to life. Then the graveyard scene. It is evening, half-light; the tombstones loom against a background of racing clouds. As Ophelia's coffin is borne to the stage, the sobbing of women is heard."

"The scene of the duel and the play are over . . ."

This play is running to crowded houses; tickets are sold two weeks in advance.

After listening to a lecture on *Hamlet,* a public discussion of the production was held in the theater with more than 600 persons present. The discussion was warm, even heated. Not only were individual elements of the production praised or criticized, but the question of whether or not the theater had correctly conceived Shakspere's great work was debated.

All in all, in 1941 there were about 500 theaters in USSR, and more than 200 of them were featuring Shakspere in their repertories. During the course of a year the Shakspere and West European Classic Department of the All Russian Theatrical Society gave 1234 consultations to directors, actors and artists. By far the largest number of these consultations—542—dealt with Shakspere.

And what about Shakspere in USSR during this terrible war with all its hardships, sacrifices and tragedy? May I be permitted to quote here a few lines from a letter by Professor Morozov, dated September 11, 1942, and addressed to Dr. A. S. Rosenbach:

> "Even in these days our scholars find it possible to make contributions to the study of Shakspere. But we are sure that in the nearest future, after our common foe will be smashed, they will devote all their energy and undivided attention to their work. In the most tremendous battle of all history we know, that Shakspere, too, is a part of the culture we are fighting to defend."

All told, 18 of Shakspere's plays were staged in the theaters of USSR prior to the war.

During the last 3 years—

Othello was played in	143 Soviet Theaters
Romeo and Juliet	78
Hamlet	51
Much Ado	39
Taming of the Shrew	37
Twelfth Night	25
King Lear	20

Millions of volumes of Shakspere's works were published in the USSR since 1917. The books appeared in 17 different languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union, including the Chuvash, Buryant, Jewish, Kazakh, Tajik and Kirghiz languages; during the 20 years before 1917 in tsarist Russia Shakspere was published in two languages only—Russian and Armenian.

Of all Shakspere's plays the greatest popularity is enjoyed by *Hamlet.* Hundreds of thousands of copies in 14 languages have been published in the USSR.

More than 200 theaters include Shakspere in their repertories. In Moscow alone Shakspere's plays are performed regularly in nine theaters.

The State Jewish Theater, under the direction of Michoels is preparing to put on *Richard III,* the Theater of the Red Army *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and the Maly Theater *King Lear.*

Boston, Mass.

BORIS PASTERNAK'S TRANSLATION OF *OTHELLO*

By Prof. M. M. Morozov

(*Edited by Eugene Blum*)

THE new translation of *Othello* was read in the lecture room of the All Russian Theatre Society by Boris Pasternak[1] on September 19. This is the fourth Shakspere translation that he has completed in these four years. The other three were— *Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet* and *Anthony and Cleopatra.*

It is doubtful whether any other Shakspere reading has ever drawn such crowds. I received innumerable telephone calls from acquaintances asking to get them tickets. The pioneer's club of one Moscow district asked for thirty tickets for children who were especially interested in Shakspere. The room, where the reading was to be held, could not accommodate all those who wished to be present. It was crowded until there was not even standing room. Window sills and isles between the seats were packed. Among the audience there were many producers, actors, artists and composers. Sergei Prokofiev,[2] who composed not only the ballet *Romeo and Juliet,* but also some very interesting suites to the dramatic productions of *Hamlet* and *Anthony and Cleopatra,* was sitting close to the stage.

In his characteristic, rather jerky manner of delivery, Pasternak explained the principles of his work on Shakspere's great tragedy. Above all, he strives for simplicity and clarity, and in this respect I must point out that he belongs to that school of Russian translators which was established by Alexander Ostrovsky,[3] noted Russian playwright, in his translation of *Taming of the Shrew,* and Apollon Griegoriev[4] in his translation of *Romeo and Juliet.*

Pasternak strives first to bring home the realism of the playwright who created living people for us. He read the play beautifully, with passion and expressiveness. The most

striking feature of his translation makes itself more vividly felt in his own reading. He does not merely quote or recreate the text, as most translators do, he does not retell the story in his own words, but begins by building up in his own imagination the distinct and concrete figures, arranging his text on this foundation. That is why each character in his translation speaks with his own voice and intonations.

The question may arise as to whether a declamatory theatric version or faithfulness to real life and the wealth of psychological color and shades is most important for the theatre today. In the first case Weinberg's[5] old translation of *Othello* would be the best choice, in the second—Pasternak's. But every critic will agree that this new translation is the work of a great poet.

When Pasternak had finished reading, there was prolonged applause. It is possible that before another year passes we shall hear his next work, the translation of both parts of *Henry the Fourth.*

Our Shakspere section of the Theatre Society is hard at work again. At the end of the month I shall read excerpts of my prose translation of *Hamlet.* This was not undertaken for the purpose of producing something of artistic value, but solely to attain the maximum faithfulness to the original. I translated all the more important readings and provided my translation with detailed commentary. At our next meeting we shall hear V. S. Uzin's paper on *Cymbeline* and then arrange an evening to hear the work of V. Levik, a young and unusually talented translator, who has given us excellent renderings of Browning's poems and some old English ballads.

---

[1]Boris Paternak is unquestionably the most distinguished Russian poet of our days. But he is not the most popular one with the masses, and could be considered "the poets' poet." I had the pleasure of reading his translation of *Hamlet;* I think it is a masterpiece of poetic art. He does not attempt to translate the English idioms into Russian, as others have clumsily done, but is inclined to furnish the most suitable Russian idioms instead. He does it so cleverly that the atmosphere remains undisturbed.

[2]Sergei Prokofiev is well-known in this country as composer, conductor and pianist; he spent considerable time in this country.

[3]Alexander Ostrovsky, of course, is the great playwright of the last century.

[4]Apollon Grigoriev is a well-known translator of Shakspere's plays.

[5]Weinberg is one of the best Shaksperian translators of the old school.

SHAKSPERE ON THE STAGES OF EREVAN, TBILISI, BAKU

By Prof. M. M. Morozov

THIS year witnessed the founding in Erevan, the capital of Soviet Armenia, of the Armenian Theatrical Society. It was only right and natural that the old All Russian Theatrical Association, wherein I have the honor of being in charge of the Shakspere Department, should from the very inception have formed bonds of closest friendship with the younger brother Association. The first result of this friendship was the joint organization this year of the traditional, annual Shakspere conference in Erevan. It was the first time in our history that the reading of our Shakspere conference papers was accompanied by a theatrical festival affording fresh evidence of the rich efflorescence in the theatrical art of Soviet Armenia.

The Sundukyan Theatre showed two admirable Hamlets (actors Vagarshyan and Janibekyan), also two no less admirable Othellos (Janibekyan and Narsessyan). There was a most pleasing performance, too, of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* by the Erevan Juvenile Theatre. In the city Leninakan, where the Shakspere conference spent a whole day, we saw a fascinating and delightful performance of *Twelfth Night,* staged by the gifted Armenian producer Ajemyan. It is not only the performances in themselves that strike one so forcibly. It is the love for culture, the ardent passion fanned by the Southern sun that one feels here so irresistibly.

I had been in Erevan ten years ago but could scarcely recognize this picturesque town situated at the foot of Mount Ararat. Small earthen houses had almost entirely disappeared. Many new buildings sprung up, reflecting the work of that wonderful Armenian Architect Tamanyan and his school. Armenia within the last ten years sensed with particular clarity its own original national artistic style. This style you feel everywhere—in paintings of the Armenian artists in local art museums and in the illustra-

tions of the ancient Armenian epic *David Sassun,*[1] made by that talented artist Ervand Kochar, and in the architecture of Tamanyan. This monumental style is virile and vigorous. You recognize it too in the Shaksperian performances in Erevan. It is not by chance that Vagarsh Vagarshyan, Erevan's finest actor, created the strong, manly, energetic image of Hamlet; neither is the admiration of the Armenian people for the monumental forms of Shakspere's art, as one lecturer at the conference observed, a matter of chance. This admiration is remarkable. I have been told here that there have been cases in Armenia of parents giving their children the name of William in honor of the great playwright.

Armenia holds in highest esteem the name of the illustrious Armenian actor of the last century Petros Adamyan, whom the most rigorous critics in Russia placed above Rossi and Salvini, as Hamlet. The memory of Khan Massegyan, the translator of Shakspere, is held in equal veneration by the classical Armenian writers.

At the present time Armenia can justly be proud of the number of its outstanding Shakspearian actors, as was shown by the festival, and its many proficient Shakspere scholars, as was evidenced at the conference at the Erevan Dramatic Theatre, which could not seat several hundreds of persons who were eager to attend the opening of the conference.

On the stage, beneath a huge portrait of Shakspere, was the table of the presidium and the platform from which speakers addressed the conference. Besides Moscow guests, there were delegations from Georgia and Azerbaijan. In the lobbies one could hear people talking in Russian, Armenian, Georgian and Azerbaijan. On the following day came the reading of the reports and papers. Although the conference continued for nine days, the hall was filled to overflowing throughout the whole time, as well as during the performances of the Shakspere festival. The conference made a one-day visit to Leninakan, the second largest city in Armenia. On stations in towns, where there are local

theatres, members of the delegations were met by the actors and actresses in national costumes. According to the custom of hospitable Armenia, they held in their hands trays bearing wine and refreshments. Not for a moment did the feeling leave me these days that it was not only the festival of culture of Soviet Armenia but also the expression of the heartfelt indissoluble friendship of peoples inhabiting our great country.

I have already mentioned the charming performance of *Twelfth Night* at Leninakan. In the background of the stage a gallery was formed with boxes in which large dolls were seated, dressed in costumes of Elizabethan England. It was as if they were attending a performance at the Globe Theatre. At the last entrance these dolls were imperceptibly replaced by real men and women and at the end of the play the dolls began to applaud. "A mere trick, a specious and unnecessary effect," will say the uninitiated. But Ajemyan, talented producer, had another aim in view and this idea struck home in his Armenian audience. When I asked one of those present what those dolls meant, he answered promptly: "Why, that means that even the dolls applaud Shakspere."

The conference came to an end, but the theatrical festival still continued. In the course of twenty-eight hours we saw three performances of *Othello* (two matinees and one evening, one matinee in Armenian the other in Azerbaijan language, by an itinerant and permanent collective farm theatre).

Intensely interesting was the Othello of Ali Zeinal, young Azerbaijan actor and playwright. His movements were full of inimitable oriental grace, his lyricism intense and tender. The translation was made by Jaffar Zhabarly, a famous Azerbaijan playwright who died some years ago. He translated some of Othello's soliloquies into rhymed verse. As read by Zeinal, they are melodious and measured. They involuntarily bring to my mind the lines of Omar Khayam in Fitzgerald's translations.

The festival over, we made a tour through the vicinity of Erevan by car. We passed endless vineyards and visited the ruins of an ancient temple at Zwarnotze and the Chmiadzin residence of the Katolikos, the head of the Armenian Church.

From Erevan we went on to Tbilisi, the capital of Soviet Georgia. The way the Georgian actors played Shakspere was wonderful! How easy are Tranio's movements in *The Taming of the Shrew*. He seems almost to be dancing; his voice rings when he sings, how gaily he laughs!—What fire in little impatient Juliet, who is so eager, so eager to see her Romeo! The Rustavelli Theatre at Tbilisi gave me one of the profoundest theatrical impressions of my life. I had the good fortune to see *Othello* acted by the Georgian Akaki Khorava, People's Artist of the USSR. The image so impressive, in powerful grandeur, temperament supreme and great mastery of technique. A triumph of theatrical art!

Tbilisi is one of the finest cities in our land; it is a large cultural center. Like Erevan it has its own Academy of Science, its own University and Pedagogical Institute. There is, moreover, an excellent Theatrical Institute. I gave a series of lectures in Tbilisi.

Shakspere is marvelously popular. Suffice it to say that lectures on Shakspere can easily collect an audience of a thousand persons.

The next stage of our journey was Baku. Here I was up to my ears in lectures. At Azerbaijan University there is a tremendous interest in Shakspere. There is a special Shakspere class conducted by Professor Mondrov. I made the acquaintance of two Shakspere scholars who are writing their theses on the theme "Euphemisms in Shakspere and Marlow." At Baku, too, I had occasion to witness two important events in the cultural life of the city: the inauguration of the Azerbaijan Theatrical Society (we have at present four theatrical societies—the All Russian of some sixty years standing and three young theatrical societies—in Armenia, Tajikistan and Azerbaijan) and the opening

of the Baku Theatrical Museum, one of the best-ordered theatrical museums in the Soviet Union.

There were no Shakspere plays in Baku for the present, but there was one scheduled at Baku Azerbaijan Theatre on this year's program. I saw a number of other performances at this interesting playhouse, some patriotic pieces describing the struggle of our heroic soldiers fighting against the Hitlerite bandits, and gay comedies of modern life and plays drawn from legends of ancient history of Azerbaijan, such as *Bride of Flames* by Jaffar Zhabarly—a play full of poignant situations, vivid national coloring and intensity of passions that somehow reminded me of certain Elizabethan plays, *e.g., The Spanish Tragedy* by Thomas Kyd. How rich and multiform is the cultural life of the free peoples of our Transcaucasia!

[1]David Sassun is a national hero of Armenia.

SHAKSPERE EN FRANCE

par MAXIMILIEN RUDWIN

"TROIS POETES, écrivit récemment Guy de Pourtalès, formaient les colonnes du temple romantique: Shakspere, Byron et Goethe." Théophile Gautier nota nostalgiquement, dans son *Histoire du Romantisme* (publiée en 1874), ses débuts littéraires en "ces temps merveilleux où Walter Scott était dans sa fleur, où l'on s'initiait aux mystères de Goethe, où l'on découvrit Shakespeare." En effet, le mouvement littéraire éclos pendant la Restauration but aux sources idéologiques de Shakspere, de Byron et de Goethe.

L'origine du romantisme en France, disons-le tout de suite, est bien française et non pas une marchandise d'importation. Il faut pourtant avouer qu'il y avait des influences étrangères—anglaises et allemandes—sur le romantisme français. Il est un fait bien admis par tous les historiens du romantisme que le cosmopolitisme fut un élément inhérent et intégrant du romantisme français. Les romantiques importaient l'étranger dans la littérature française. Mais tandis que les classiques s'étaient inspirés de l'antiquité, les romantiques s'inspiraient des littératures étrangères modernes. Il faut pourtant ajouter que, à l'opposé des classiques, les romantiques, qui luttaient pour la liberté de l'art et le rajeunissement de l'inspiration et qui réclamaient la souveraineté de l'imagination, faisaient appel á l'exemple des littératures étrangères, pas à leur autorité.

La vogue de la littérature anglaise venait en premier, suivie bientôt par celle de la littérature allemande. Les grands poètes des pays nordiques fascinaient, de leur gloire et de leurs créations, l'imagination française durant la période romantique. Mais le romantisme n'est pas resté un élément étranger dans la littérature française. Quand le romantisme français empruntait de l'étranger, il transformait ses emprunts. Ce qui est mieux, c'est que la littérature française pendant l'ère romantique, ranimée par les littératures étrangères, réagissait à son tour sur elles et leur

imprimait un essor que les auteurs étrangers eux-mêmes s'étaient plus à reconnaître.

Chateaubriand, l'initiateur du mouvement romantique, revint d'Angleterre avec son sac de manuscrits et ramena le romantisme de ce pays-là, traduisant et commentant les plus originaux des poètes anglais. Mais ce "sachem du romantisme," pour nous servir de l'expression de Théophile Gautier, ne goûta point William Shakspere (1564-1616), le plus grand poète dramatique de l'Angleterre et le grand maître de tous les romantismes. Mais après l'intervention de Mme de Staël, l'autre initiateur du romantisme français, en 1804, l'opinion française changea à l'égard du génie universel d'Angleterre. Dès lors, Shakspere devint le maître qu'invoquaient les romantiques français.

Indubitablement, l'oeuvre de Mme de Staël exerça l'influence la plus évidente et la plus profonde sur les destinées de la littérature française. C'est cet écrivain qui mit définitivement la littérature du Nord à la mode en France. Jusque là elle était bien à la mode, mais d'une façon vague. De fait, l'ascendant des littératures septentrionales se faisait voir déjà dans la littérature française du XVIIIe siècle. Le courant de l'influence anglaise remonte à Voltaire, tandis que l'amour de la littérature allemande est dû à Rousseau. La vogue de la littérature et de la pensée anglaises fut très grande au milieu du XVIIIe siècle. Presque tout écrivain anglais, y compris Shakspere, attira l'attention des lecteurs français de ce temps-là.

C'est un fait très curieux que Shakspere semble avoir été longtemps inconnu en France. Les écrivains français du seizième et même du dix-septième siècle ont totalement ignoré le grand tragique anglais, qui a porté plus loin que tout autre dramaturge l'éloquence et l'émotion dans la peinture des passions tragiques. La seule exception à cette indifférence et ignorance à l'égard de Shakspere est présentée par Cyrano de Bergerac, qui a bien lu et quelque peu pillé *Cymbeline, Hamlet* et *le Marchand de Venise* dans sa comédie de *la Mort d'Agrippine* (1653).

Mais il fallut que Voltaire, en 1731, exprimât son

admiration pour Shakspere pour exciter enfin la curiosité du public; encore le fit-il à sa manière en l'appelant "le Corneille de Londres, grand fou d'ailleurs, mais il a des morceaux admirables". Le patriarche de Ferney fut en quelque sorte le champion de Shakspere en France: le romantisme lui a de grandes obligations.Voltaire a contribué par ses *Lettres philosophiques* (1734) et par ses préfaces de *Brutus* (1730) et de *la Mort de César* (1735) à faire connaître l'oeuvre shaksperienne aux Français. Il tenta même maladroitement de transférer sur le théâtre français quelques scènes du poète anglais, qu'il traita d'ailleurs de "barbare". Il croyait aussi lui avoir emprunté, das *Zaïre* (1732), dans *Eriphyle* (1732) et dans *Sémiramis* (1748), tout ce que le dramaturge anglais était susceptible de prêter aux Français du XVIIIe siècle. Diderot fit davantage pour l'ascendant de Shakspere en France dans un article de son *Encyclopédie* (1772).

Jean-François Ducis, qui admirait Shakspere à côté de son illustre contemporain Voltaire, réussit mieux à faire connaître le dramaturge anglais en France. C'est Ducis qui donna au Théâtre-Français les premières adaptations de Shakspere. Il tira des drames de Shakspere des singulières tragédies, ni classiques, ni romantiques, d'une remarquable maladresse: *Hamlet* (1769), *Roméo et Juliette* (1772), *le Roi Lear* (1783), *Macbeth* (1784) et *Othello* (1792). Mais Ducis fut un initiateur, qui passa une camisole de force à Shakspere. Le société française ne pouvait goûter que ces rédactions de Shakspere, et après 1820 elle s'y plaisait encore.

Shakspere fut également traduit par Pierre Letourneur de 1776 à 1782. Voltaire accueillit avec mépris et presque avec fureur les adaptations de Ducis et la traduction de Letourneur. Il écrivit à propos de la traduction de Shakspere par Letourneur une *Lettre à l'Académie sur Shakespeare* (1776), où il traite le dramaturge anglais de "sauvage ivre" et de "Gilles de la foires". L'opinion de Voltaire au sujet de Shakspere a subi un revirement sensible. Le vieux Voltaire a perdu son anglomanie, et il a été surtout amer envers le dramaturge anglais. Il se plaint dans cette

lettre adressée à l'Académie française que ce "bouffon", qu'il a d'ailleurs introduit en France, est en train de dégrader et de dénationaliser la tragédie française. Voltaire, qui a fait un pas vers le romantisme par son admiration pour Shakspere, revient dans sa vieillesse à son premier amour pour Racine.

Mais la vogue de Shakspere s'est renouvelé pendant la période romantique. Charles Nodier, le maître du romantisme, recommandè Shakspere au seuil du XIXe siècle dans ses *Pensées sur Shakespeare* (1801). François Guizot, inspiré par les idées de Mme de Staël, ranime l'enthousiasme des Français pour l'oeuvre shaksprienne. L'influence de Shakspere, traduit, en 1821, par Guizot (une révision de la traduction de Letourneur), ne cesse pas de grandir par un progrès régulier. Shakspere est nettement et sensiblement abordé dans les articles du *Globe,* ce qui prouve une révolte contre l'attitude voltairienne à l'égard du poète anglais. Parmi les autorités que les romantiques évoquent est Shakspere. Stendhal commente Shakspere, en 1822, dans sa fameuse brochure *Shakespeare et Racine.* Prosper de Barante et Abel-François Villemain publient des études louangeuses sur le dramaturge anglais.

Shakspere est directement apporté en France par une compagnie théâtrale britannique. En 1827-1828, une troupe d'acteurs londoniens donne, en anglais, une série de représentations à l'Odéon de quelques chefs-d'oeuvre du poète, qui enflamment la bande turbulente de toute la gent chevelue des Jeune-France aux gilets éclatants. Les Parisiens raffolent de ces représentations des acteurs anglais, qui transportent d'enthousiasme la jeunesse romantique et qui révèlent à Alfred de Vigny, à Victor Hugo, à Hector Berlioz, à Alexandre Dumas le plus grand génie dramatique de tous les temps.

Le premier, Vigny fit jouer une adaptation d'*Othello ou le More de Venise* (1829) qui n'est pas trop au-dessous du modèle et qui réussit, malgré une cabale admirablement menée. Sa traduction du *Marchand de Venise* (1839) ne fut jouée qu'en 1905. Dès lors, les tentatives de mettre les

pièces shaksperiennes sur la scène française se multiplièrent. Pour ne citer qu'un seul autre exemple de l'engouement français pour Shakspere: George Sand fit jouer, en 1856, *Comme il vous plaira.*

Shakspere fut un des poètes favoris de Victor Hugo, qui tomba, comme tous les grands romantiques français, sous l'influence du barde d'Avon. Victor Hugo lut Shakspere quand il était un "grand diable de seize ans," et il garda toute sa vie une profonde admiration pour lui. "J'admire tout dans Homère, dans Shakespeare et dans la Bible," écrivit-il. Déjà, dans sa jeunesse, l'admiration de Victor Hugo alla à Shakspere, qu'il rangea parmi les plus grands génies de tous les temps: Eschyle, Dante, Milton et Shakspere (*Toute la Lyre*: "les Sept Cordes" IV,v). Parmi les noms qui ont été incrustés sur la cheminée d'Hauteville-House en lettres gothiques damasquinées d'or mat, dans des cartouches entourées de motifs d'ornements du même style, se trouva Shakspere. Il écrivit une préface très élogieuse, en 1864, à la belle traduction de Shakspere faite par son fils François-Victor Hugo (1859-1866).

Victor Hugo, par dévotion pour Shakspere, s'apprêta à renouveler le drame. Shakspere fournit la plus grande partie des arguments du principal manifeste romantique, la préface à *Cromwell* (1827), qui fut bourrée de mitraille et où il proposa le mélange du pathétique et du burlesque, du gracieux et du grossier. La présentation des bouffons et des foules par le grand auteur tragique anglais est à ce point à la base de la pratique de Victor Hugo. "De la féconde union du laid et du beau, de la tragédie et de la comédie, naît le drame", proclama Victor Hugo dans sa préface à *Cromwell,* "formulant, deux siècles après Shakespeare, le credo d'une esthétique dont le poète anglais avait déjà largement brossé les lumières et les ombres" (Guy de Pourtalès).

La riche imagination du célèbre dramaturge anglais a dû évoquer chez Victor Hugo, comme chez tous les romantiques français, tout un monde de créations fantastiques et diaboliques. L'auteur de *Cromwell* a bien constaté que

"certains côtés sinistres de Shakespeare sont hantés par les spectres (*Shakespeare* II, ii,2[14]). C'est pourquoi il l'appelle "le Satan de votre art poétique" (*l'Ane* I,v). Il est intéressant de noter à ce sujet que le romancier américain Frédéric Arnold Kummer, dans son curieux ouvrage *Gentlemen in Hades* (1930) met Shakspere en enfer, où il est directeur du meilleur journal du royaume des ténèbres, la *Gehenna Gazette*.

Il est vrai que Shakspere n'a jamais introduit dans ses pièces, même les plus fantastiques, la personne du diable. Pourtant, son oeuvre contient les noms de vignt diables, bien qu'ils soient toujours dans les coulisses. Il faut ajouter que, dans *Henri VI*, la Pucelle d'Orléans évoque des diables sur la scène. Divers commentateurs pensent pourtant que la pièce n'est pas du grand Will. Mais, d'après aux-mêmes, Shakspere l'aurait, tout au moins, arrangée. A l'instar de Shakspere, Victor Hugo ne fait jamais paraître le diable en personne dans son théâtre. La seule fois qu'il y paraît, c'est en qualité de souffleur dans les *Comédies injouables* (*Toute la Lyre*: "les Sept cordes" VII,x,1). Les drames de Victor Hugo, où se montre le plus l'influence de Shakspere, sont surtout pleins de diablerie et de sorcellrie. Les expressions diaboliques pullulent dans *Cromwell* (1827). La pièce *Mangeront-ils?* du *Théâtre en Liberté* (écrit en 1869), où Victor Hugo se montre le plus l'imitateur de Shakspere, donne une large place à la sorcellerie. Un acte a même pour titre "la Sorcière". La pièce se joue dans l'île de Man, où la démonologie médiévale est encore très vivace. On croit toujours dans cette île que le diable y danse avec toute sa phalange de démons à Noël.

Quand Hector Berlioz, he plus grand compositeur français, qui a renouvelé la musique pendant la période romantique, assista aux représentations des pièces shakspériennes, il fut foudroyé, et l'artiste fut né dans ce pauvre diable sans expérience. Mais cédons la parole à Guy de Pourtalès, auteur de l'excellente biographie *Berlioz et l'Europe romantique* (1938), qui décrit l'impression qu'a créée la représentation d'*Hamlet* sur le jeune musicien comme suit:

> Il avait besoin de rire, de pleurer, dépouser le drame dans sa chair vivante, de faire jaillir tout un foisonnement de musique, toute une postérité d'Hamlets. Il devenait Shakespeare, et, le devenant, se sentait Berlioz.

Hector Berlioz, qui épousera plus tard l'héroïne shakeperienne Harriet Smithson, qui était venue en France avec la troupe des acteurs londoniens, composa, entre autres, les ouvertures au *Roi Lear,* au *Songe d'une Nuit d'Eté,* à *Roméo et Juliette,* à *la Tempête* et le *Scherzo de la Reine Mab.*

Shakspere fut également le maître littéraire d'Alexandre Dumas, qui ne pouvait manquer de subir l'influence du dramaturge anglais. Il affirma qu'*Hamlet* lui avait ouvert un nouveau monde dramatique et avoua que ses tableaux historiques devaient beaucoup à Shakspere. Des réminiscences du barde d'Avon se trouvent aussi dans la pièce *Don Juan de Moraña ou la Chute d'un Ange* (1836).

Les fantaisies sylvestres d'Alfred de Musset sont des échos de la *Douzième Nuit* et *Comme il vous plaira* de Shakspere. Quelques-uns des personnages des pièces fantastiques du poète français nous rappellent Ariel, le joueur de tambourin, qui chevauche les nuages frisés, l'ingénieux serviteur des fantaisies du poète anglais.

Parmi les romantiques français qui ont chanté la gloire de Shakspere, il faut signaler Auguste Barbier, le poète des immortels *Iambes* (1931).

L'influence shaksperienne se révèle aussi dans les *Enfants d'Edouard* (1833) de Casimir Delavigne, dans le *Théâtre de la Révolution* (1898-1902) de Romain Rolland et dans plusieurs des pièces de Maurice Maeterlinck.

Notons aussi le bel opéra en cinq actes d'*Hamlet* (1868) avec paroles de Michel Carré et Jules Barbier et musique d'Ambroise Thomas.

Parmi les études critiques sur Shakspere de la période

post-romantique, il faut signaler les articles d'Emile Montégut (1883).

Les principales traductions complètes des oeuvres dramatiques de Shakspere sont celles de Pierre Letourneur, de François-Victor Hugo et d'Emile Montégut (1866-1869).

Après la libération de France on a annoncé la traduction ou plutôt l'adaptation d'*Hamlet* faite par André Gide, le plus grand écrivain européen de notre temps. En même temps, on a fait monter *Antoine et Cléôpâtre* à la Comédie française de Paris.

Qu'il nous soit permis d'ajouter, pour conclure cet article, que, par l'influence qu'il a exercé en France surtout durant l'ère romantique, Shakspere n'a fait que rendre aux Français ce qu'ils lui avaient prêté. Le grand dramaturge anglais est, comme on le sait bien, un des plus grands débiteurs de Michel Montaigne (1533-1592), l'un des plus grands esprits de tous les temps.

New York, N. Y.

WHY NOT FLEANCE?

By JOHN C. MCCLOSKEY

BECAUSE the first murderer in *Macbeth* asks, "Was't not the way?" most commentators believe that it was he who extinguished the light and thus aided Fleance's escape. Yet there is no apparent reason why he should have done so, unless one accepts the tenuous hypothesis that this act imputed to him is the swift, momentary interposition of the hand of Providence. And if one does accept this hypothesis it is apparent, nevertheless, that the more logical agent of Providence is the mysterious third murderer rather than the first or second, unless one accepts the equally untenable hypothesis that the third murderer is Macbeth himself. If it could be assumed, and there is no evidence for such an assumption, that the speeches of the third and first murderers following the slaying of Banquo have been transposed, the question of who put out the light might devolve upon the solution of the identity of the third murderer, provided one does not insist that he is Macbeth himself. The question of the light is a puzzling one, yet there is a solution other than those heretofore proposed.

In the working out of this solution it should be recalled that the first and the second murderer are desperate men persuaded to slay Banquo for personal revenge and for the consequent favor of King Macbeth. Nothing in their lines, or in those of anyone else, suggests that they have any desire of, or any motive for, frustrating the murder of Banquo's son and thus being accessory to the escape of Fleance.

This escape, according to Shakspere's historical source, actually did occur. The problem, then, for the dramatist was to present it plausibly on the stage. Why may it not be assumed, therefore, that the knocking out of the light is primarily a dramatic device to permit Fleance to escape in a manner theatrically convincing?

What evidence is there for such an assumption? Although the stage direction in the First Folio reads: "Enter Banquo and Fleans, with a Torch," most modern editions place the

comma after Banquo, thus: "Enter Banquo, and Fleance with a torch." Delius remarks, in the *Variorum Shakespeare,* that in the line "Give me a light there, ho!" Banquo is calling for a light from one of his servants, because he and Fleance are about to strike off into the footway, while the servants make a circuit of the castle, with the horses. Collier (ed. 1) explains that Fleance carries the torch to light his father. Collier says: ". . . in the old stage-direction nothing is said about a *servant,* who would obviously be in the way, when his master was to be murdered. The *servant* is a merely modern interpolation."

Since I agree with Collier on this point, for dramaturgically the presence of a servant to report the murder or to summon help would be a blunder, I believe that when Banquo and Fleance enter, it is Fleance who carries the torch; and I believe that in the stage direction *torch* means simply that and not *torchbearer.* All three of the murderers set upon Banquo. Here it should be noted that although the First Folio has no stage direction, most modern editions of the play read: "They set upon Banquo," not upon Banquo and Fleance.[1] This leaves Fleance apart holding the torch. What does he do? Before Banquo dies he shouts to his son: "Fly, good Fleance, fly, fly fly. Thou mayest revenge. O slave!" Now if Fleance has normal common sense he is not going to run away with a blazing torch in his hand lighting the way of the murderers to him. So as he sees his father being murdered and hears his command to flee and escape, what could be more natural and more logical than that Fleance himself should strike out the torch he was holding, thus concealing himself in the darkness and making good his escape?

Because of the necessity of presenting Fleance's historical escape convincingly on the stage, Shakspere had the murderers, in the heat of the action, fail to attack or to secure the boy. During the time consumed by them in making twenty gashes upon the body of Banquo, the torch has been extinguished. So busy were the three in murdering Banquo that they did not notice who struck out the torch; hence the question "Who did strike out the light?" on the

part of any of them might not be unexpected. The reply of the first murderer can be explained, with some plausibility, by pointing out that the murder is occurring in a park near the palace and that the extinguishing of whatever revealing light is at hand is a logical process of concealment from passersby and from whoever might by chance be watching from the palace. The mere fact that the first murderer, busy at the time of extinguishing the light in inflicting his portion of the twenty gashes upon Banquo, asks the question after the murder has been done is no proof that he himself knocked out the light; it is proof of nothing beyond the fact that he approves of the murder being done under the cloak of darkness and that he considers the putting out of the light the correct procedure under the circumstances. It so happened, however, that Fleance himself put out the light and thus escaped.

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

[1]The Globe edition: "They fall upon Banquo and kill him; in the scuffle Fleance escapes."

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE *SECOND MAIDEN'S TRAGEDY* AND *THE REVENGER'S TRAGEDY*

By RICHARD H. BARKER

(*Conclusion*)

III. *The Revenger's Tragedy*

THE Revenger's Tragedy was entered in the Stationers' Register (along with Middleton's *Trick to Catch the Old One*) on October 7, 1607,[14] and published anonymously in the same year. It remained anonymous until the middle of the seventeenth century, when it was attributed to Tourneur in two play lists—one by Archer (1656) and one by Kirkman (1661).[15] For more than two centuries it was accepted as Tourneur's—accepted, that is, until the era of textual scholarship began, when doubts were expressed by three different authorities—Fleay (1891),[16] Schelling (1908),[17] and Oliphant (1911).[18] All were quite sure that it was unlike the one play known to be by Tourneur; Fleay suggested Webster as a possible author, and Oliphant very tentatively suggested Middleton. In 1919 the case for Tourneur was revived by Sykes,[19] but in 1926 the case for Middleton was made much stronger by Oliphant, who in that year published the first careful and systematic study of the text.[20] Oliphant's views were accepted by some scholars,[21] but rejected—rather warmly rejected—by others, notably Nicoll, who in 1930 published an edition of Tourneur,[22] and T. S. Eliot, who reviewed Nicoll's work.[23] Further arguments for Tourneur were given by Miss Ellis-Fermor (1935)[24] and by Parrott and Ball (1943).[25]

The Case for Tourneur. The fact that Archer and Kirkman ascribed the play to Tourneur is evidence of a sort, but not very good evidence. For the seventeenth-century booksellers often made the wildest guesses about authorship. Archer, for example, ascribed *A Trick to Catch the Old One* to Shakspere.

The internal evidence offered by modern scholars is not,

on the whole, much more satisfactory. Sykes lists phrases and mannerisms that appear in both *RT* and *The Atheist's Tragedy,* but he overlooks the fact that most of the same phrases and mannerisms appear in Middleton.[26] Nicoll finds that the two plays have much the same point of view, much "the same dark and ironical attitude towards life."[27] He is not very specific, but he seems to believe that the irony in *RT* is evidence for Tourneur. Eliot relies on the purely negative argument that the characters in the play are quite different from those in the tragedies that Middleton wrote some fifteen years later. This is true, but Eliot ignores Middleton's early comedies, notably *Your Five Gallants,* a play in which the characters are (as he says of those in *RT*) "distortions, grotesques, almost childish caricatures of humanity."[28] Miss Ellis-Fermor finds certain general resemblances and certain general differences between the images in *RT* and *The Atheist's Tragedy,* and from this she infers that the two plays were written by the same man at different times.[29] But the inference is scarcely justifiable. She might quite as well infer that the plays were written at the same time by different men. Parrott and Ball compare *RT* with Tourneur's early poem, *The Transformed Metamorphosis.* They see in both the same curious juxtaposition of "Marston's obsession with vice, specifically with sexual vice, and Spenser's worship of chaste beauty."[30] But they exaggerate: there is not much sex in the poem and not much Spenser in the play.

The Case for Middleton: 1. Irony. RT is an even better example of Middleton's irony than the *SMT.* The chief characters—Lussurioso, the Duke,. Gratiana, Ambitioso and Supervacuo, even Vindice and Hippolito—work against their own interests, set in motion the forces that bring about their own ruin. They are treated just as Proditor, Follywit, and Hoard are treated in Middleton's early drama, and they sometimes behave in almost exactly the same way.

At the beginning of the play, for example, Lussurioso is interested in debauching the virtuous Castiza; but when he wants a pander, he consults Castiza's brother Hippolito, the very man he should by all means avoid. Hippolito recommends Vindice, Castiza's other brother, and Lussurioso

at once betrays himself—charges a brother with a sister's ruin, even boasts of his wit at the very moment when he himself is outwitted.

> *Lussurioso.* That was her brother
> That did prefer thee to vs.

We may laugh at that simple age within him.

> *Vindice.* Ha, ha, ha.
> *Lussurioso.* Himselfe being made the subtill instrument,
> To winde vp a good fellow.
> *Vindice.* That's I my Lord.
> *Lussurioso.* That's thou.
> To entice and worke his sister.
> *Vindice.* A pure nouice!
> *Lussurioso.* T'was finely manag'd. (I, iii, 148-149, 155-163.)

In *The Phoenix* Proditor wants to murder the Duke of Ferrara, but in singling out a murderer, he relies on the advice of Fidelio, the best friend of the Duke's son. Fidelio recommends Prince Phoenix himself, and Proditor accepts him without question. He charges a son with a father's murder, boasts—just as Lussurioso boasts—of his superior cunning.

> *Proditor.* Nay, give my words honour; hear me.
> I'll strive to bring this act into such form
> And credit amongst men, they shall suppose,
> Nay, verily believe, the prince, his son,
> To be the plotter of his father's murder.
> *Phoenix.* O that were infinitely admirable!
> *Proditor.* Were't not? it pleaseth me beyond my bliss.
> Then if his son meet death as he returns,
> Or by my hired instruments turn up,
> The general voice will cry, O happy vengeance!
> *Phoenix.* O blessed vengeance! (IV, i, 5-15.)

Later in the play Ambitioso and Supervacuo scheme to save their nameless brother, the one called the Youngest Son of the Duchess, and at the same time to get rid of Lussurioso, who stands between them and the dukedom. For both the Youngest Son and Lussurioso are under sentence of death, the one for rape, the other for attempting his father's murder. Ambitioso and Supervacuo are very sure of themselves,

very proud of their skill at intrigue. They get possession of the ducal signet, take it surreptitiously to the officers of the prison, and order the immediate execution of the Duke's son. But by failing to specify which of the two sons they mean, they defeat their own purpose. Subsequently they congratulate themselves, even quarrel when they try to decide who thought up so ingenious a plan.

> *Ambitioso.* Was not this execution rarely plotted?
> We are the Dukes sonnes now.
> *Supervacuo.* I you may thanke my policie for that.
> *Ambitioso.* Your policie, for what?
> *Supervacuo.* Why wast not my inuention brother,
> To slip the Iudges, and in lesser compasse,
> Did not I draw the modell of his death,
> Aduizing you to suddaine officers,
> And een extemporall execution?
> *Ambitioso.* Heart, twas a thing I thought on too .
> *Supervacuo.* You thought ont too, sfoote slander not your thoughts
> With glorious vntruth, I know twas from you. (III, vi, 2-13.)

The reader can scarcely help remembering the scene in *A Trick to Catch the Old One* in which the three followers of Hoard engage in a quarrel, each contending that he contributed most to the conquest of the courtesan-widow.

> *First Gentleman.* Did not I use most art to win the widow?
> *Second Gentleman.* You shall pardon me for that, sir; master Hoard knows I took her at best 'vantage.
> *Hoard.* What's that, sweet gentlemen, what's that?
> *Second Gentleman.* He will needs bear me down, that his art only wrought with the widow most.
> *Hoard.* O, you did both well, gentlemen, you did both well, I thank you.
> *First Gentleman.* I was the first that moved her.
> *Hoard.* You were, i'faith.
> *Second Gentleman.* But it was I that took her at the bound.
>
> (III, iii, 21-29.)

The dialogue is substantially the same as the dialogue between Ambitioso and Supervacuo, and the irony is used in exactly the same way.

2. *Style.* The harsh and bitter style of the play—a re-

flection of the author's harsh and bitter mood—is described as well as illustrated in Castiza's line: "Your Tongues haue struck hotte yrons on my face" (II, i, 259). The author repeatedly strikes with hot irons; in his more characteristic passages, his language invariably sears and burns. He is more fond of metaphors than of similes, more fond of short incisive metaphors than of long ones. He likes puns, especially harsh jangling puns, not because they display his ingenuity, but because they help to intensify the grotesque effect at which he aims. The pun on *brook* at the very moment of the Duke's death (III, v, 234-235) is an obvious illustration.

There are few echoes of this style in *The Atheist's Tragedy,* and not many more in the later plays of Middleton, where imagery and word-play are handled quite differently. But there are often suggestions of it, and there is sometimes a style that closely resembles it, in the early Middleton, notably (I think) in *The Phoenix,* the one early Middleton play that contains a substantial number of serious scenes. Such lines as the following seem to me particularly significant:

> — This lord sticks in my stomach.
> — How? take one of thy feathers down, and fetch him up.
> (II, ii, 277-279.)
> Necessary mischief,
> Next to a woman, but more close in secrets! (IV, i, 21-22.)
> Treason grows ripe, and therefore fit to fall:
> That slave first sinks whose envy threatens all. (IV, i, 27-28.)
> I'm sick of all professions; my thoughts burn. (IV, ii, 101.)
> He the disease of justice, these of honour,
> And this of loyalty and reverence,
> The unswept venom of the palace. (V, i, 159-161.)

So too are a number of other lines that illustrate the word-play—the puns that explode when one least expects them in the course of the most serious dialogue. Phoenix, deploring the evils done in the name of Law, suddenly shifts from metaphor to pun:

> to have
> A suit hang longer than a man in chains,
> Let him be ne'er so fasten'd. (I, iv, 223-225.)

Castiza, trying to save her husband from violence, describes him as her "dear sweet captain," and Phoenix replies:

> Lady, you wrong your value:
> Call you him dear that has sold you so cheap. (II, ii, 299-300.)

Lines like these might well have appeared in *RT*.

3. *Diction.* Sykes points out that the diction of *RT* is less elaborate and less stilted than that of *The Atheist's Tragedy* (which, like Tourneur's *Funeral Poem,* contains many words ending in *—tion*). But it is perhaps possible to go farther than this, to say that—in some cases at least—the diction of *RT* is characteristic of Middleton; and I would mention as particularly good cases the words *slave* and *comfort.* The first is used 26 times, chiefly of course as a term of abuse. It is used 12 times in *Your Five Gallants,* 12 times in *The Phoenix,* and 8 times in *Michaelmas Term,* but it does not appear at all in *The Atheist's Tragedy.* The second word, *comfort,* has long been recognized as a favorite of Middleton's. It appears 17 times in *RT,* but only twice in *The Atheist's Tragedy.*

Oliphant points to several unusual words, like *unbribéd, hereafter* (used as an adjective), and *sasarara,* all of which appear in Middleton. But he overlooks what seems to me the most important of them—the word *luxur,* used in I, i, 12 and II, ii, 129. The *New English Dictionary* describes it as a rare word of uncertain origin and lists only two other examples of its use—both in pamphlets that Middleton published in the year 1604. *Luxur* may well be a coinage of Middleton's.

4. *Mannerisms.* Oliphant mentions several mannerisms that Middleton and the author of *RT* have in common: 1. A fondness for making one character express agreement with what another has said. 2. A fondness for using *troth* or *faith* with *true,* as in "Troth he sayes true." 3. A fondness for characterizing minutes, hours, and days, as in "one false minute," "harmonious houres," etc. 4. A fondness for the idiom "give . . . due" as in "giue Reuenge her due."

5. A fondness for ironical asides which confirm remarks just made. Oliphant also points to several Middleton mannerisms that are illustrated once or twice in the course of the play, but this is a less satisfartory sort of evidence.

5. *Versification.* It has long been recognized that the versification is more like Middleton's than Tourneur's. Oliphant mentions a number of different tests, but the simplest of them, the test of feminine endings, is quite satisfactory.

Play	No. lines tested	No. fem. endings	Percentage fem. endings
Revenger's Tragedy	400	110	27.5
Phoenix	250	67	26.8
Michaelmas Term	150	36	24
Atheist's Tragedy	500	37	7.4

6. *Oaths and Ejaculations.* The oath *in faith* is used about as frequently as in the early days of Middleton.[31]

Play	Total no. oaths	No. of *faith*
Revenger's Tragedy	98	44
Phoenix	83	35
Michaelmas Term	102	58
Atheist's Tragedy	45	9

Push occurs 6 times; *tush* does not occur.

7. *Parallels.* In the following list I have ignored the many parallels pointed out by Oliphant and other scholars, and given only those that I myself have noticed.

Turnes my abused heart-strings into fret. (I, i, 16.)

Cf. *Chaste Maid,* I, ii, 54-55:

when the string
Of his heart frets.
— What comfort bringst thou? how go things at Court?
— In silke and siluer brother. (I, i, 56-57.)

Cf. *Michaelmas Term,* induction, l. 35:

Crept up in three terms, wrapt in silk and silver.
A Rape! why tis the very core of lust. (I, ii, 47.)

Cf. *Michaelmas Term,* III, iv, 266:

To beguile goodness is the core of sins.
sfoote the slaue's
Already as familiar as an Ague
And shakes me at his pleasure. (I, iii, 39-41.)

Cf. *Father Hubburd's Tales,* VIII, 93: . . . then shaking me by the sleeve as familiarly as if we had been acquainted seven years together.

for honesty
Is like a stock of money layd to sleepe,
Which nere so little broke, do's neuer keep. (I, iii, 129-131.)

Cf. *Phoenix,* II, ii, 20-21, where Castiza mentions "chaste credit" and goes on to say:

Well may I call it chaste; for, like a maid,
Once falsely broke, it ever lives decay'd.
Nay then I see thou'rt but a puny in the subtill Mistery
of a woman. . . . (I, iii, 173-174.)

Cf. *Roaring Girl,* II, i, 142: . . . like a puny at the inns of venery. . . .

Now let me burst, I'ue eaten Noble poyson. (I, iii, 191.)

Cf. *Black Book,* VIII, 32: . . . to gorge every vice full of poison, that the soul might burst at the last. . . .

How hardly shall that mayden be beset,
Whose onely fortunes, are her constant thoughts,
That has no other childes-part but her honor,
That Keepes her lowe and empty in estate.

Why had not vertue a reuennewe? (II, i, 2-8.)

Here Castiza opens the act with a soliloquy on dowerless maids. Cf. *No Wit,* I, ii, 3-10, where Mistress Low-Water opens the scene with a soliloquy on distressed gentlewomen. "Has virture no revenue?" she asks, and she goes on to develop the image used by Castiza:

Where are our hopes in banks? was honesty,
A younger sister, without portion left,
No dowry in the chamber beside wantonness?
Why say so mad-man, and cut of a great deale of
durty way. . . . (II, i, 19-20.)

Cf. *Mad World,* I, i, 74-75: . . . to be short, and cut off a great deal of dirty way. . . .

That forty Angells can make fourescore diuills. (II, i, 101.)

Cf. *Family of Love,* I, ii, 154: But angels make them admirable devils.

my spirit turnes edge. (II, i, 122.)

Cf. *Phoenix,* V, i, 205:

Our duties shall turn edge upon our crimes.
troupes of celestiall Soldiers gard her heart. (II, i, 157.)

Cf. *Mad World,* IV, i, 31:

Celestial soldiers guard me!
Virginity is paradice, lockt vp.
You cannot come by your selues without fee.
And twas decreed that man should keepe the key! (II, i, 176-178.)

Cf. *No Wit,* II, i, 16-20: You must think, sweet widow, if a man keep maids, they're under his subjection. . . . They have no reason to have a lock but the master must have a key to't.

Hell would looke like a Lords Great Kitchin
without fire in't. (II, i, 279.)

Cf. *Widow,* I, i, 29-31: There's like to be a good house kept then when fire and water's forbidden to come into the kitchen.

A right good woman in these dayes is changde
Into white money with lesse labour farre. (II, ii, 31-32.)

Cf. *Phoenix,* I, iv, 245-246: . . . he does determine to turn her into white money. . . .

But set spurs to the Mother; golden spurs
Will put her to a false gallop in a trice. (II, ii, 53-54.)

Cf. *No Wit,* III, i, 35-36:

I know the least touch of a spur in this
Will now put your desires to a false gallop.
The pen of his bastard writes him Cuckold. (II, ii, 121.)
This their second meeting writes the Duke Cuckold. (II, ii, 147.)

Cf. *Phoenix,* I, ii, 100:

he'll one day write me cuckold.
To Grace those sins that haue no grace at all. (II, ii, 151.)

Cf. *Michaelmas Term,* II, iii, 453-454:

— A very good grace to make a lawyer.
— For indeed he has no grace at all.
This woman in immodest thin apparell
Lets in her friend by water. (II, ii, 155-156.)

Cf. *Witch,* II, i, 47-48: . . . to come by water to the back-door at midnight. . . .

Also *Game at Chess,* II, ii, 45-46 (shee and I haue clapt a Bergayne up/ Lett in at Watergate).

The craftiest pleader gets most gold for breath. (II, ii, 280.)

Cf. *Father Hubburd's Tales,* VIII, 106:

Those pleaders . . .
That wrestle with the arms of voice and air;
And lest they should be out, or faint, or cold,
Their innocent clients hist them on with gold.
A Dukes soft hand stroakes the rough head of law,
And makes it lye smooth. (II, ii, 291-292.)

Cf. *Triumphs of Truth,* VII, 260:

I was not made to fawn or stroke sin smooth.
My haires are white, and yet my sinnes are Greene. (II, ii, 360.)

Cf. *Roaring Girl,* V, ii, 124:

Their sins are green even when their heads are grey,
As some old gentlewoman in a Periwig. (III, v, 116.)

Cf. *Family of Love,* II, ii, 2-3: . . . more lively and fresh than an old gentlewoman's glazed face in a new periwig.

Giue me that sin thats ro'd in Holines. (III, v, 147.)

Cf. *Game at Chess,* II, ii, 141-143:

but to finde Sin . . .
Under a Robe of Sanctitie.
sfoote iust vpon the stroake
Iars in my brother—twill be villanous Musick. (IV, i, 32-33.)

The idea of jarring music occurs frequently in Middleton; cf., for example, *Mad World,* III, ii, 148-149:

There struck the minute that brings forth the birth
Of all my joys and wishes; but see the jar now!
And thou hast put my meaning in the pockets,
And canst not draw that out. (IV, ii, 99-100.)

Cf. *No Wit,* II, ii, 96-97:

> Deal plainly, heaven will bless thee; turn out all,
> And shake your pockets after it.
> Iue ene forgot what colour siluers off. (IV, ii, 110.)

Cf. *Phoenix,* III, i, 195-196: . . . what colour's silver, I pray? you ne'er saw money in your life. . . .

> Nay doubt not tis in graine, I warrant it hold collour. (IV, ii, 255.)

Vindice is saying that his scheme is a good one. Cf. *Mad World,* III, iii, 81-82, where Follywit expresses approval of a scheme: . . . nay, 'tis in grain; I warrant it hold colour.

> But there desires are thousand miles about. (IV, iii, 23.)

Middleton is fond of this idiom; c.f., for example, *Black Book,* VIII, 20: . . . some whose brains are above an hundred mile about. . . .

> A drab of State, a cloath of siluer slut,
> To haue her traine borne vp, and her soule traile i' the
> durt. (IV, iv, 80-81.)

Cf. *Phoenix,* V, i, 28-29:

> Thou see'st thy daughters with their trains borne up,
> Whom else despisèd want may curse to whoredom.
> In three houres reading, to vntwist so much
> Of the black serpent, as you wound about me. (IV, iv, 143-144.)

Cf. *Game at Chess,* IV, iv, 9-10:

> When they haue woond about our constant Courages
> The glitteringst Serpent that ere falshood fashiond.
> . . . how quaintly hee died like a Polititian in
> hugger-mugger. . . . (V, i, 17.)

Cf. *Changeling,* V, ii, 28-29:

> I'll rather like a soldier die by th' sword,
> Than like a politician by thy poison.
> Ile tug in the new streame. (V, i, 125.)

Cf. *No Wit,* II, iii, 258-259:

> the streams of fortune,
> 'Gainst which he tugs in vain.
> Winde vp your soules to their full height agen. (V, ii, 7.)

Cf. *Mad World,* I, i, 161:

> To have our wits wound up to their stretch'd height.
> A piteous trag æ dy, able to make
> An old-mans eyes bloud-shot. (V, iii, 90-91.)

Cf. *Mad World,* III, ii, 26-27: . . . here's a sight able to make an old man shrink!

It is now possible to review and interpret the evidence gathered in the preceding pages. The *SMT* and *RT* show certain points of resemblance to one another; they also resemble the plays of Middleton in thought, in style, and in phrasing. The *SMT* is particularly close to a group of Middleton plays that were almost certainly written after 1611; *RT* is particularly close to a group written between about 1602 and 1608. It would perhaps be possible to explain some of the resemblances—say those between the *SMT* and the later Middleton—by a theory of imitation, but it would be much more difficult to explain all of them in the same way. One would have to believe that Middleton was a close student of two anonymous tragedies, that he formed his early style after he had read the first of them, that he subsequently changed his style after he had read the second. But this is not very likely, quite apart from the eccentric dating that it involves. A more reasonable belief would seem to be that Middleton was himself the author of both plays.

Brooklyn College,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

---

[14]Edward Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London,* 1554-1640 (London, 1875-94), III, 360.

[15]W. W. Greg, *A List of Masques, Pageants, &c.* (London, 1902), p. cii.

[16]Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle,* II, 264, 272.

[17]Felix E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama,* 1558-1642 (Boston and New York, 1910), I, 568.

[18]Oliphant, "Problems of Authorship in Elizabethan Dramatic Literature," pp. 427-428.

[19]Sykes, "Cyril Tourneur."

[20]Oliphant, "The Authorship of 'The Revenger's Tragedy.'" See also Oliphant, *Beaumont and Fletcher,* pp. 90-92, and *Shakespeare and His Fellow Dramatists,* II, 1-3.

[21]Letters in *Times Literary Supplement,* April 23, 1931, and June 18, 1931. Also Wilbur D. Dunkel, "The Authorship of *The Revenger's Tragedy,*" *PMLA,* XLVI (1931), 781-785.

[22]Tourneur, *Works,* pp. 18-20.

[23]T. S. Eliot, *Selected Essays,* 1917-1932 (New York, 1932), pp. 161-162. See

also letters by Oliphant and Eliot in *T.L.S.*, December 18, 1930, January 1, 1931, February 5, 1931; and Oliphant, "Tourneur and Mr. T. S. Eliot," *Studies in Philology*, XXXII (1935), 546-552.

[24]U. M. Ellis-Formor, "The Imagery of 'The Revengers Tragedie' and 'The Atheists Tragedie,'" *Modern Language Review*, XXX (1935), 289-301. See also Harold Jenkins, "Cyril Tourneur," *Review of English Studies*, XVII (1941), 21-36.

[25]T. M. Parrott and R. H. Ball, *A Short View of Elizabethan Drama* (New York, 1943), pp. 215-216.

[26]"Serious business" appears in *Women Beware Women*, II, ii, 18 and IV, i, 182; "You speak oracle" (which is close to "Tis Oracle") in *Father Hubburd's Tales*, VIII, 101. Middleton is fond of antithetical couplets and of the contraction *'t* for *it*.

[27]Tourneur, *Works*, p. 19.

[28]Eliot, *Selected Essays*, p. 162.

[29]As a preliminary step, Miss Ellis-Fermor classifies the images in both plays; but her classification is not always accurate. See, for example, "The Imagery of 'The Revengers Tragedie' and 'The Atheist's Tragedie,'" p. 297, where she apparently sets down the metaphor of grinding the executioner's axe (*Revenger's Tragedy*, III, i, 29-30) as an image from domestic life.

[30]Parrott and Ball, *Short View*, p. 216.

[31]See Paul Wenzel, *Cyril Tourneurs Stellung in der Geschichte des englischen Dramas* (Breslau, 1918), pp. 111, 112, 117, 122-123.

A PROLOGUE FOR *THE WINTER'S TALE,*

ACTS IV AND V

Accompanied by Dumbshow
An outdoor presentation

by

The Masque and Gown
Bowdoin College

May 21, 1943

Text by Stanley P. Chase
Stage directions by George H. Quinby

The Prologue is read from a scroll by an actor in Elizabethan costume, who introduces the personages of the play as they appear in dumb show. Entrances are made UC, UR, UL, DR, and DL. A bench is at C. Action at the Court of Sicily is kept right stage, and departures to Bohemia are to the left.

Immediately after the Prologue, the acting of the play with lines is begun with Act III, Scene iii.

THE PROLOGUE

Enter Prologue C, with scroll. Bows, and X to above bench.

Your patience, gentles, till we shall unfold
A story of an age long past, but now
Set forth anew by our good friend and fellow,
Will Shakespeare.

[*Foot on bench.*]
[*Gesture R.*]

ONCE UPON A TIME—how long
Ago I know not, but 'twas when Sicilia
Was yet a kingdom of that Grecian world
That Athens peopled; still from Sicily went
Its yearly gift to Delphi's Oracle,
Where was the hallowed shrine of great Apollo.
Hardly could it have been the age of Pericles,
Or of Theocritus, for other kingdoms
Then flourished that those worthies knew not of.
[*Gesture L.*] Bohemia's pleasant vales and meadows sloped
Down to the sea-coast—for Bohemia had
A sea-coast then—and, league on league across
The eastern steppes, held mighty Russia sway.
The rulers of those states sent embassies
Each to the other, made alliances
Through marriage of their daughters and their sons,
Paid visits,—quite as did the feudal lords

Of the later Europe that we know; nor was
The daily life of men much different,
Truly to speak, from that of this our London
Of good King James. Yet all were worshippers
Of Jupiter and Juno, Mars, and bright Apollo,—
Or thus, saith Will, the ancient records say;
'Twere best, methinks, to take his word, nor press
[*X ULC*] Too curious inquiry.

ONCE UPON A TIME,

Whenever 'twas, there ruled in Sicily
[*Enter Leontes UR.*] A king, still young, Leontes, generous
[*Enter Cleomenes, Dion, and others UR, bow to King, and break to UR.*] And noble-hearted, such that all the court
Held him in thought less as their sovereign lord
Than as a brother—e'en the more because
[*Enter Hermione, UR. Courtiers bow. Leon. leads her to seat at C.*] He was married to Hermione, than whom
There was no lady in Sicilia, none,
More gracious or more bless'd in every gift
Of mind and heart. By her Leontes had
[*Mamilius runs in R and sits by Herm. Leon. pats his head.*] A son, Mamilius, now a five-years' boy,
Of promise sorting well his parentage.
No faintest shade of jealousy had e'er
Clouded the love betwixt this royal pair;
Her husband he, but still her lover. Chief
[*Enter Camillo DR. Bows. Crosses to other courtiers UR.*] Among his counsellors, Camillo stood,
By title "Cup-bearer"; older somewhat
Than Leontes, wise in ways of court and world,
A loyal friend. Of ladies o' the court, one
[*Enter Paulina UR; whispers to Herm., who smiles; then joins courtiers.*] Was very close to Queen Hermione:
By name, Paulina, something sharp of tongue,
Forsooth, but downright, great of heart and spirit.
[*Enter Antigonus UR.*] Her spouse Antigonus was called, a sportsman,
Whose talk was of his stables and the races.
[*Cam. gestures off DR.*] Fortunate in his marriage, King Leontes
[*Herm. and Mam. rise.*] Was also blessed in a life-long friendship with
[*Enter Polixenes DR; goes to Leon., who greets him warmly, URC.*] Polixenes, companion of his bosom
From boyhood days, and crown'd Bohemia's King;
Who, after many years of separation,
Has paid a nine months' visit at the court
[*Pol. bows, and gestures off L.*] Of Sicily, and now would take his leave,
Despite entreaties of Leontes and

Hermione that he prolong his visit
One month more. Polixenes is urging
The pressure of affairs, desire to see
His family, and most of all his son,
Young Florizel, almost the same in years
As Prince Mamilius. But still Leontes
Will not be satisfied, and begs Hermione
Once more to pray their guest that he delay
His going. She complies with this request,
To so good purpose that Polixenes,
Won over, promises a month's extension
Of his stay. But as she pled, in innocence
Of friendship and entreaty hospitable

[Pol. X to Mam. and puts hand on head.]

[Herm. X to Pol.]

[Pol. leads Herm. to exit DR, followed by all but Leon. and Cam.]

Taking his hand, Leontes has conceived
So shameful a suspicion that I shrink
Even from naming it. Such disorder'd thoughts
The gods, or demons, sometimes send to plague
The best of men. Leontes sees his Queen,
His friend, as guilty lovers; feels the horns
Sprouting upon his forehead; thinks the babe
With whom Hermione grows round apace,
The unlawful issue of Polixenes;
And presently divines a monstrous plot
Against his life, his state, his crown. In short,
This King becomes as 'twere a man possess'd:
No argument can pierce, no feeling touch
His changëd mind; but all his former love
Is turned to hate and longing for revenge.
Camillo, who receives his confidence,
In vain protests against the baseless charge,
But finally consents to do his bidding,
Which is, this very night to kill Polixenes
By mixing in his drink a deadly drug:
This easily the "Cup-bearer" might do.
But secretly Camillo all this while
Is thinking fast and hard; the transformation

[Leon. shows suspicion and calls Cam. to him.]

[Leon. paces back and forth while Cam. tries to calm him.]

[Cam. nods head. Leon. gestures pouring wine, pats Cam. on shoulder, and exit UR.]

Of the King he sees for what it is, sheer madness,
And so finds means in season to acquaint
Polixenes of the plot against him, and
To aid him in escape,—the fleeing guest
Himself accompanying, to make his home
Henceforth in far Bohemia.

[Cam. X DRC. Pol. enters DR, X to Cam., who gestures UR. Pol. shows surprise and gestures off L. As they exeunt UL, Dion enters DR and X to call Leon. UR.]

[*Leon. enters UR, X UC shaking fist, sends Dion DR for Herm. She enters DR, followed by court. Leon. upbraids her. All react with horror.*]

Leontes,
Told of the flight that foiled his wish'd revenge
Upon the Queen's supposëd paramour,
On her now turns his rage, in open court
Accusing her of infidelity,
In terms most gross, of plots and treacheries,
And all, I know not what, his sick mind shapes
Of foul surmise. How must we pity her,
So loyal, true, of noble lineage born
(The daughter of the Emperor of Russia),
Insulted, spurn'd, like common prostitute
Or "lazar kite of Cressid's kind," by him
Who swore to love and cherish her! At first,

[*Herm. turns to Paul., who shrugs shoulders and shakes head.*]

Surpris'd, she scarce can comprehend his meaning;
Then, as the drift grows plain, in all the power
Of injur'd womanhood she makes reply
Courageous, clear and strong, yet temperate

[*Herm. faces Leon. and replies.*]

Withal: "No, by my life! How will this grieve you,
When you shall come to clearer knowledge, that
You thus have publish'd me! Gentle my lord,
You scarce can right me throughly then to say
You did mistake." She lacks not champions:

[*Leon. turns away. All courtiers move in on him.*]

The courtiers one and all denounce this rash,
High-handed action of a king who seems
Transformëd from the man they've known before.
Defying his command, with hands clench'd tight
And blazing eyes, they loose their angry tongues
Against him,—none with greater vehemence
Than good Paulina and Antigonus.

[*Leon. turns on them and gestures. Dion exit DR and returns with Gaoler, who leads Herm. off DR. followed by Paul.*]

But all without avail; they cannot change
The horrible fix'd purpose of the King,
Whose sway is absolute. Hermione
Is led away to prison, there to await
A formal trial.

[*Leon. beckons to Dion and Cleo. and instructs them. They bow and exeunt UR, followed by Antig.*]

As is customary
In matters of such weight, the King despatches
Couriers to the Oracle at Delphi—
Cleomenes and Dion were their names—
To ask the judgment of Apollo on
The charge against the Queen.
Three weeks go by.
Mamilius, who is of tender thought
Beyond his years, grows ill from sorrow at

[*Leon. enters UR with scroll; X and sits C.*]

His mother's plight. Leontes,—shunn'd by all,
Tormented in his mind, bereft of sleep,

[*Antig. enters UR. X DR to guard entrance.*]

And plagued by nightly terrifying visions,—
Is worn and haggard: still his purpose holds.

[*Paul. enters DR carrying baby, pushes past Antig., goes to Leon., and holds out baby to him.*]

One day, Paulina, though he has forbidden
Her entry, brushes past the palace guards,
In her arms the baby girl Hermione
Has been delivered of in prison. This
She lays at his feet, bespeaking his protection.

[*He rises, calls Antig., and indicates baby. Antig. shows indignation.*]

The King is stirred to fury, deeming it
The bastard offspring of Polixenes,
And orders it committed to the flames
Forthwith; but such reproach and clamor rise
From all the courtiers that he is persuaded

[*Paul. gives baby to Antig.*]

To cancel that decree and let the babe,
Instead, be banishëd—hard fate enough,
But mildest sentence they can wrest from him.

[*Leon. gestures off L. Antig. takes baby to exit DL. Paul. X UR weeping.*]

He bids Antigonus to take the child
To some remote and desert place, and there
To leave it unprotected. This, upon
His sacred oath, the lord has sworn to do.
In due course ye shall witness what ensues.
The day set for the trial comes at last.

[*Cleo. and Dion enter DR with scroll and X URC.*]

Cleomenes and Dion are returned
Bearing the message of the Oracle,

[*Herm. and Gaoler enter DR and hold below Paul. Judge enters DR. Stands back to audience.*]

The seals unbroken. Now Hermione
Must make her answer to the monstrous charge.
Alas, that one so virtuous, so kind,
So true, must suffer such indignities
As never queen endured! The accusation

[*Leon. reads from his scroll. Gestures to Herm., and sits C.*]

Is read, the so-called evidence detailed—
All figments of the King's diseasëd mind.

[*Herm. speaks to Judge.*]

A calm, well reasoned plea Hermione
Presents, in which, not deigning to refute
Particulars, she bases her defence
Upon the lack of all substantial proof,
And on her own known purity and honor.
The King, however, deaf to reason's voice,
Is but the more determined to undo her.
Confident of the god's support, he calls
On Dion and Cleomenes to render

[*Leon. rises and gestures to Dion, who reads from his scroll.*]

Great Apollo's answer. Silence falls
On all the assemblage, as they break the seals;
And this is what is read:
"Hermione is chaste; Polixenes blameless;

Camillo a true subject; Leontes a jealous
tyrant; his innocent babe truly begotten;
and the king shall live without an heir,
if that which is lost be not found."
"Praised!" is the single word her lips let fall. . . .
"He whom the gods do wish destroyed, they first
Make mad." Leontes swears there is no truth
I' the verdict; he blasphemes the Oracle
Of great Apollo; and the sure fulfilment
Of great Apollo's Oracle begins:
Mamilius, so says one entering,
From grieving o'er his mother's grief, has died.
And as the madness came upon Leontes
Suddenly, so all suddenly it goes:

By grief helped of his blindness, sight returns:
"Apollo's angry, and the gods themselves
Do strike at my injustice." But too late!
At news of her son's death, Hermione,
Fainting, was carried from the room, and now
Paulina comes with tidings of one more,
One last, one crowning loss—O miserable!—
The Queen herself, Hermione, has died.
And thus this King, through causeless jealousy,
Has lost his wisest counsellor Camillo,
His friend Polixenes, his son, his daughter,
And, last, his Queen. Henceforth in penitence
And sorrow he will pass his wretched days,
Surrounded by a court that loves him well
But still remembers. . . .
Mamilius had said, "A sad tale's best
For winter"—child's unconscious prophecy
Of these so sad events. But look around:
Not winter, but the jocund spring is here;
And in what now ensues we promise you
Some spring-time scenes that shall assuage the pain
Your gentle hearts have felt. Still, ere we come
To those, there is one further grievous sight
That we must show: Antigonus exposing
The babe named Perdita on foreign shore.
'Tis on the sea-coast of Bohemia
He lands, and tenderly lays down the child
According to his oath.

My part is done:
Farewell! Forget not what I promised you:
One more distressful sight to bear, and then
Heigh ho, for sunburnt mirth and love i' the spring-time!

[All react strongly.]

[Leon. grabs scroll and tears it.]

[Messenger enters DR and speaks. Paul. helps Herm. exit UR. Messenger, Gaoler, and Judge exeunt DR.]

[Leon. drops on bench C.]

[Paul. enters UR, X to Leon., gestures UR, shakes fist at Leon., and exit UR. Courtiers X and kneel by Leon. He rises and exit UR slowly, followed by courtiers.]

[Prologue X to above bench.]

[Prol. X UC.]

[Prol. exit UC.]

LA MISA DEL GALLO AND SHAKSPERE'S "BIRD OF DAWNING"

By T. M. Pearce

THOSE who subscribe to the universality of Shakspere's genius will not be surprised that a religious festival in a New Mexican village should supply a commentary upon a well known passage in one of his greatest plays, nor that unlettered farmers in a small Spanish town would comprehend more fully the passage in question than all the editors in English who have conned his plays since they first appeared. Of course, the rural folk in New Mexico could never have witnessed a Shakspere play, because, first, no playhouse of a formal kind has ever existed in their communities, and, second, plays in English would not appeal to people whose native tongue is Spanish. But, granted a common medium of communication and an appropriate presentation, the New Mexican villagers would understand Shakspere at this point better than the most literate and sophisticated audience. And, so far as I have been able to discover, they would comprehend him better than the scholars who have ransacked the libraries for parallels to every reference in his plays.

The passage to which I refer is *Hamlet,* I, i, 158-60. Horatio has accompanied Marcellus to see the phantom reported by the guards who have beheld it on the ramparts of Elsinore twice previously. "Thus twice before, and jump at this dead hour, with martial stalk hath he gone by our watch," explains Marcellus to Horatio, who has doubted the reality of such spectacles. After the ghost's manifestation, Horatio confesses the "fear and wonder" it has provoked in him and predicts some "strange eruption" to the state. He calls to mind the portents in the night before Julius Caesar was murdered. The like precurse and harbingers have appeared as omens to other portentous events. The ghost returns and the watchers strive to stop it. The phantom attempts to speak. A cock crows, and, startled, like a guilty thing, the ghost withdraws again. Horatio observes:

> I have heard
> The cock, that is the trumpet to the morn,
> Doth with his lofty and shrill-sounding throat
> Awake the god of day; and at his warning,
> Whether in sea or fire, in earth or air,
> Th' extravagant and erring spirit hies
> To his confine; and of the truth herein
> This present object made probation.

Marcellus has heard a like report, though his information is more specific as to time and place. He replies:

> It faded on the crowing of the cock.
> Some say that ever, 'gainst that season comes
> Wherein our Saviour's birth is celebrated,
> The bird of dawning singeth all night long;
> And then, they say, no spirit dare stir abroad.
> The nights are wholesome, then no planets strike,
> No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm,
> So hallow'd and so gracious is the time.

Horatio is familiar with this folk tale. "So I have heard," he affirms, "and do in part believe it." Then he points out the coming of dawn over "you high eastward hill." He and Marcellus go off to acquaint young Hamlet with the experiences of the night.

In this passage, both Marcellus and Horatio indicate that there is a popular belief that on the eve of Christmas, the cock, or "bird of dawning," sings in honor of the Christ child. His song signals a night of blessedness when evil is thwarted, and "hallowed" and "gracious" is the time. It is this folk belief, in part credited by Horatio, that is so fully accepted by Spanish natives in New Mexico today.

Scholars have supplied very little that is helpful on this passage.[1] Kittredge has pertinent notes on Horatio's reference to the crowing of the cock as a warning of sunrise, when "trolls, devils, and the like" flee the sunlight. He gives citations to *Midsummer Night's Dream* and to Prudentius' *Ad Galli Cantium*. But of Marcellus' speech about the "bird of dawning" and the season of "our Saviour's birth" Kittredge has only two rather indirect notes. Both are etymological: l. 158, "'gainst" as "just before," and l. 162, "wholesome" as "free not only from witchcraft and demonic influence, but from contagion, which was com-

monly ascribed to the night air. Cf. *Julius Caesar,* i, 1, 265, 266."[2]

Near Albuquerque, the seat of the state university, where tomes of Shakspere scholarship are housed in the library, is the little town of Belén, New Mexico. The name of the town is Spanish, and corresponds in English to the name Bethelehem. In Belén, on Christmas Eve, as in other communities where there are Catholic churches, midnight masses are sung. In Spanish Catholic communities, however, the service is called *La Misa del Gallo,* an idiomatic phrase among all Spanish speaking peoples for the mass of Christmas Eve or Christmas morning.[3] In the Philippines, there is a little hill-town called Janiuay, on Panay island, where *La Misa del Gallo* is accompanied by a folk practice which illustrates the ancient belief about the adoration of the *Niño de Dios* by the cock and by other members of the animal kingdom. During the mass a bell is rung and at this signal worshippers in the congregation bleat, crow, and moo, creating a harmony of sounds such as creatures beside the manger may have made seeking the blessing of Christ.[4] One of the parishioners in the church at Belén was among the workmen constructing a house for the writer. He asked me if I knew how Belén came to be named. I did not. "You know on Christmas Eve, when Christ is born, the animals are in the manger?" I nodded. "Well, then the lamb says, 'Bee-ee-lén.' " He pronounced this with a drawn out, bleating sound. "And the rooster says, 'Cree-ess-to na-aa-ció. Cristo nació. Christ is born."

La Misa del Gallo is only one of the ceremonies celebrated by the Spanish Americans at the season of the nights called *Las Posadas.* The phrase means "The Inns" or "The Houses." A brief description of the services in the houses of the villagers during *Las Posadas* may indicate how "gracious" the time really becomes.

Nine nights before Christmas eve various people in the village ask for the privilege of erecting altars in their homes. One house, with its altar, is chosen for the ceremonies of each night. The villagers gather there for prayers and hymns. The altar is decorated with paper flowers and lighted by candles. On the altar are statues of Joseph and

Mary. After the service, the statues are carried in procession to the house of a neighbor where the meeting is to be held the next night. In front of this house, the people sing the traditional song in which Joseph asks to be admitted to the inn. Someone within the house sings a response refusing to admit him or Mary. Then, after further pleading, the parents of Jesus are admitted. All the company follows and the host for that evening offers wine, cookies, and other refreshments. The pageant continues the remaining nights, with progress of the statues from house to house until the night before Christmas. On that night the statues are taken to the church where an altar has been especially prepared. Here Mary, Joseph, and the Christ Child in his cradle, are placed upon the altar, and the worshippers await the midnight mass.

Frequently during Christmas week a play called *Los Pastores* accompanies *Las Posadas.* The play re-enacts the story of the shepherds and the star of Bethlehem, supplemented by warfare between St. Michael and the Devil, and humorous dialogue between a lazy shepherd named Bartolo and his companions.

La Misa del Gallo disappeared in England with the Reformation.[5] Miracle plays were transmuted into finer dramatic ore, witness Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* and the "Good Angel—Bad Angel" lines of Laucelot Gobbo in Shakspere's *Merchant of Venice.* In New Mexico, however, when "that season comes wherein our Saviour's birth is celebrated," *La Misa del Gallo,* of a fact, confirms the power of goodness to thwart witches and evil spirits, and the natives, after viewing *Los Pastores* on the Holy Eve, cry "Feliz Natividad," for it is "La Nochebuena" or the "good," "gracious," time.

The University of N. M., Albuquerque

---

[1]On lines 158-160 I have found no comment in the editing of H. H. Furness (18773, Israel Gollancz (1901), E. K. Chambers (1917), Hardin Craig (1931), Parrot and Helfer (1931), Holzknecht and McClure (1936), G. L. Kittredge (1939), or Neilson and Hill (1942).

[2]*Five Plays of Shakespeare,* G. L. Kittredge, ed., 1939, "Hamlet," p. 137.

[3]Real Academia Española. *Diccionario de la Lengua Española,* Décima Sexta Edición, 1939.

[4]This information is supplied by John David DeHuff, Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

[5]*The Book of Days,* R. Chambers, ed., Vol. II, pp. 736-37.

INFORMATION WANTED

To meet the requirements of scholars engaged in certain researches, we would be very grateful to persons sending us information regarding Shakspere clubs and associations in America. The information required includes the following data: Name and address of the club or association, whether incorporated, date when organized, number of members, name of chairman or president, name and address of secretary, dues per annum, frequency of meetings, purpose of the organization, character of Shakspere study, list of publications (if any) by members or the association, list of members and their occupations or professions. Send information to the editor, Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th St., New York 25, N. Y.